UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,057	03/29/2006	Jean-Luc Veron	12928/10029	7991
	7590 04/19/201 dson & Kappel, LLC	EXAMINER		
485 7th Avenue	* *	MONDT, JOHANNES P		
14th Floor New York, NY	10018	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/19/2011	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/574,057	VERON, JEAN-LUC		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JOHANNES P. MONDT	3663						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 April 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further con</li> </ol>			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);							
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	-					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 23-25 and 30-34.		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected. <u>23-25 and 30-34.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowand	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
April 13, 2011.	/JOHANNES P MONDT Primary Examiner, Art U							
	· ·····ary =xaminor, rat o	5555						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Proposed Amendment substantially amended claims 23-25, 30, 31 and 34 which would require further consideration and / or search The previously raised issue of new matter for claim 23 is claim-specific and remains. The proposed amendment cannot be deemed to place the application in better condition for appeal because those claims proposed to be amended have not even been examined. /J.M./..

a/s: annotated front page of Proposed After-Final Amendment.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: For arguments on 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph, see item 3 under NOTE. Concerning applicant's travesre of the rejection under 103(a), viz. pp. 8-10, argument in bold on page 9 is not persuasive, because what needs to be learned from Benecek is the moving of the single fuel rods in capsule 7 within quiver (identified as the "loading structure") 40. Figure 9 and the referred-to discussion thereof in col. 6, I. 42+ of Beneck teaches the moving of the individual fuel rods within the loading structure or quiver (here 46, which is shown in Figure 9). With regard to travesre of rejection of claim 34 applicant appears to overinterpret gas filling location as laterally displaced from the loading location (see Figure 4 in Kraus and discussion thereof as cited). /J.M./..